

Date: Sat, 1 Jan 94 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #559
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 1 Jan 94 Volume 93 : Issue 559

Today's Topics:

 cw speed
 cw waivers
 Spirit of radio... (2 msgs)
 The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 1 Jan 1994 01:22:23 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!
news.iastate.edu!metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>
>My point was that this also applies to the people who are working on
>upgrading, who are trying to improve their code speed, and who don't
>object to the current licensing structure. The people who post here
>tend to be those who complain about the current system. Occasionally,
>one of the large majority who don't object to the current system is
>goaded into responding.

Ahh, silence==assent. I don't agree. Silence==no strong opinion.

>Incidentally, if the code is the thing that is holding everyone back,
>why are there so many General class hams, when they could easily take

>the Advanced level exams and upgrade without having to take a code
>test? They can't all be people who made it to General only recently
>and are in transit to Advanced, since in many cases their licenses go
>back several years.

Sure, many people who stop at General are the people who aren't heavy on the theory (this is fairly obvious). What about the other side? I'm interested in HF, but I'm not interested in code. I'm a computer engineer and I can take all the theory that you care to throw at me. The Advanced and the Extra class theory are a joke. I had tougher 'theory' in sophomore physics. I'm interested in very weak signal digital modes--on HF. Why should I be kept from doing so?

Sure, the FCC is bound by the international regulations, but, as has been pointed out before, all they have to do to get out of it is to say that they want out. They have actually voted **for** that restriction because they think that **we** want it. It's time that we let the FCC know (through the ARRL or directly) that we are tired of the code requirement on HF. If people want to use morse, fine, I don't mind--it's a useful proven mode of communication and these people enjoy it. I say 'let them.' Just don't make me learn your favorite mode. Let me choose my own modes to operate in. 'Live and let live' works both ways.

Just to make this clear for Gary, I'm willing to work. I don't mind that. I have worked my butt off for the past four years in getting my degree in computer engineering. I don't believe in memorizing information and spewing it back out on tests--no matter how much some profs want just that. I have learned tons of theory and I'm willing to learn more. I just don't want to learn something that I have no use for (morse). I'm studying it now because it is the only way to get the access to the HF spectrum that I want. If that's the system, then I'll do it and get it over with. Just because I'm learning it doesn't mean that I agree that I should have to. It's a shame that I have to waste time learning morse when I could be spending that time more productively by working on something that I'm more interested in.

One thing that I do want to do is to make sure that things get changed so that the people who come into the hobby after me won't have to go through what I've had to. My first elmer was a coded tech who was first licensed when he was 13. He has been more help to me than any of the Extras in the local ham radio club. They are too interested in chewing the rag on 75m then they are in the future of ham radio--either the technology or the people. Maybe it's time that amateurs put back into amateur radio what they have gotten out of it.

Cheers,
David (N0YMV)

--

willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

Date: 31 Dec 1993 09:42:35 -0800
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw waivers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(Earl Morse) writes:

>How about giving the theory tests in CW? At 20 WPM for extra, 13 WPM for
>general and advanced, etc. Then we could bring back the sending tests so
>you could give your answers. :) Couldn't resist.

However, you may have to send some of the questions using a more
modern mode such as SSTV or Packet. How else would you send a
schematic diagram?

Sorry. The devil made me do it. :-) :-)

Whichever side of the code war we are in, Happy New Year to *all*
Hams and future Hams who read this...

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 93 06:23:39 EST
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nigel.msen.com!caen!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Spirit of radio...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

...green spleen... <dobrowol@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> writes:

> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
>
> Now, if many people in his project were hams, then he could very well
> broadcast that info in the form of a normal conversation
> (over simplex even...if he wanted to keep it relatively local...) However,

> most people who live in his project probably don't have the financial
> means to be active hams...

I know people that have got on the air for under \$5. (The cost of the testing session.)

> >You misunderstand. This forum's sole purpose is to debate policy issues.
>
> I, too, like a good debate. However, the non-cooperation and elitism I
> was referring to was the very-non-debatelike 'snobby' attitudes that I
> keep seeing by some hams on various forums - even on the air.

In any group of humans you will have ones with 'attitude problems'. I have to admit I have never heard much 'snobby' attitudes on the air (at least locally).

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 93 06:28:05 EST
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nigel.msen.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Spirit of radio...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

...green spleen... <dobrowol@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> writes:

> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
>
> >The reason the two groups clash is that we (amateur radio) by and large
> >obey the rules. If a rule is opposed, we work WITH the FCC to change it.
> >We do NOT just break the rule.
>
> I think that a big reason for that is that it is easier for hams to
> petition and change FCC policy than it is for non-corporate pirates
> to do the same. Part of that, of course, is the sheer number of hams
> and the very organized nature of support in the ham communities.

But you yourself commented on all the bickering going on in the ham

community. You can't have it both ways.

> Furthermore (and this is more of a personal opinion) it seems that
> commercial interests have much more of a direct influence and pull on
> the FCC in the public broadcasting bands than in the ham bands. (Jeez,
> even public broadcasting stations are getting kicked in the ass...)

Really? Our 220 band lost 2 out of 5 Mhz to commercial interests.

> >But don't break the
> >law and then come to a law abiding group and expect us to accept it.
>
> I'm not entirely sure that what many micro radio people want from the
> ham community is acceptance... Maybe what some want is for others to
> realize that micro radio is not entirely about breaking the law for the
> sake of breaking it...

Then change it. Write a proposal to the FCC to either integrate your ideas into existing services or create a service for it. If your ideas REALLY do have merit and really do serve the public interest, then you should be able to get backing from congress, the public (your supposed audience), all over. Stopping unlawfull activites while you do this would sure strenghten your case (those making the proposal that is). The important thing, as with ANY government agency, is keep trying. Keep plugging away.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1993 19:56:04 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!psinnntp!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5DJcFc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>

> > In article <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
> > Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
> > >Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
> > >memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
> > >punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
> > >is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?
> >
> > If learning the code is so easy, why are people bitching so mightily?
>
> Because to some, it is a useless skill. And no other part of the tests
> require PASS/FAIL like morse testing.

Ah yes, the famous "I can't do it so it must be a useless skill" excuse.
As far as the pass/fail radio is concerned, in order for one to pass the
Morse test, they must have at least 7 out of 10 questions correct, or at
least 1 minute solid copy. What this boils down to is a 70% passing mark
(not the 100% mark as you would lead us to believe). The written elements
require a 74% passing mark.

Have you EVER taken a Morse element, Dan, or are you a Codeless
Technician? Perhaps you should take one first, before mounting a campaign
against Morse, for the lazy, shiftless, or useless.

--Robert

--

Date: Sat, 1 Jan 1994 00:39:15 GMT
From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <willmore.757382291@metropolis.gis.iastate.edu>, willmore@iastate.edu
(David Willmore) writes:

> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:
> >dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
> >> Because to some, it is a useless skill. And no other part of the tests
> >> require PASS/FAIL like morse testing.
> >
> >Ah yes, the famous "I can't do it so it must be a useless skill" excuse.
> >As far as the pass/fail radio is concerned, in order for one to pass the
> >Morse test, they must have at least 7 out of 10 questions correct, or at
> >least 1 minute solid copy. What this boils down to is a 70% passing mark
> >(not the 100% mark as you would lead us to believe). The written elements
> >require a 74% passing mark.
>

> You misunderstand his statement. You must pass the morse element and the
> theory element. What Dan was advocating was the score on one being able
> to compensate for the other. In other words, a score of 100 on the theory
> would make it possible to get 44 on the code--a total of 144 (70+74) percent
> 'points'. On the other hand, the theory weak person could get 44 on the
> theory if they passed the code perfectly.
>
> Dan, please correct me if I'm wrong here, but this is what your comments lead
> me to believe.

Okay, Dan, it's up to you. Do you believe that:

- (A) The Morse elements should be retained, however the score should be a composite of both the written and Morse elements.
- (B) The Morse elements should be dropped, because a certain number of Codeless Technicians and amateur-wannabes bitch that they are just too difficult.

Keep in mind, though, that they were not too difficult for the hundreds of thousands of hams who came before the current crop of liberal, welfare-state, Carter/Mondale/Rodham-Clinton parasites who have overrun Two Meters in particular, and ham radio in general, as of late.

--Robert
--

Date: Sat, 1 Jan 1994 00:22:18 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!
gatekeeper.es.dupont.com!esds01.es.dupont.com!
COLLINST%esvx19.es.dupont.com@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec28.184600.4067@es.dupont.com>,
<1993Dec29.100758.18380@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Dec30.133922.28987@es.dupont.com>,<1993Dec30.183606.27247@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Reply-To : collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec30.183606.27247@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>Heh, I liked that movie. Morse is not dead yet, any more than
>black powder shooting is dead. But both are very specialized
>niches today that find very little use on the battlefield, or
>in other modern pursuits. Soldiers are no longer required to

>demonstrate proficiency with a Brown Bess before being issued
>an M16, but for some reason amateurs are still required to
>demonstrate manual Morse before being allowed to use more
>modern methods, even at the 03 Springfield level, on HF.
>
>I'll go even further than that, however. I believe (personal
>observation and opinion) that too much high speed Morse usage
>actually causes psychological effects that are damaging to the
>user, such as delusions that Morse is a language rather than an
>alphanumeric encoding. It also seems to foster a slowness of
>thought and reluctance to accept progress that is damaging to
>the service.
>
>Gary
>--
>Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
>Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
>534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
>Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

When you have nothing else to say Gary you try
to use insults....

Whether one likes or dislikes CW is a personal
thing and just one mode of many for todays Amateur
Operator. Its part of the testing today and I'm
glad it still is, as with the weak theory testing
it at least keeps the HF bands from anarchy ie.
10 meters.

I supported the No-Code Technician to get people
into the ARS who were being discouraged by the
Morse Code requirement, but I'll be damn if I sit
by and watch a bunch of 'welfare-minded' Hams
try and give away the HF spectrum, that is crowded
enough with world-wide transmissions. I'm sure
that there will be enough supporters of protecting
the HF spectrum to block any free give away of the
same.

Thanks & 73 | "Get your facts first, and then you can
Tom WI3P | distort them as much as you please."
collinst@esvax.dnet.dupont.com| Mark Twain
*** MY EMPLOYER DOESN'T SPEAK FOR ME NOR I FOR THEM ****

Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1993 23:58:11 GMT
From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec25.214654.5428@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<5DJcFc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <CIx0pH.Frp@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>c.e
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

rcoyale@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:
>dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:
>> Because to some, it is a useless skill. And no other part of the tests
>> require PASS/FAIL like morse testing.
>
>Ah yes, the famous "I can't do it so it must be a useless skill" excuse.
>As far as the pass/fail radio is concerned, in order for one to pass the
>Morse test, they must have at least 7 out of 10 questions correct, or at
>least 1 minute solid copy. What this boils down to is a 70% passing mark
>(not the 100% mark as you would lead us to believe). The written elements
>require a 74% passing mark.

You misunderstand his statement. You must pass the morse element and the
theory element. What Dan was advocating was the score on one being able
to compensate for the other. In other words, a score of 100 on the theory
would make it possible to get 44 on the code--a total of 144 (70+74) percent
'points'. On the other hand, the theory weak person could get 44 on the
theory if they passed the code perfectly.

Dan, please correct me if I'm wrong here, but this is what your comments lead
me to believe.

Cheers,
David (N0YMV)
--

willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #559

